DOCUMENT RESUME

CS 504 031

ED 224 057

AUTHOR Parcells, Frank E.; Kleinau, Marvin D.

TITLE Expanding Educational Horizons in Illinois: The Preparation of Public School Teachers as Effective Communicators.

PUB DATE Nov 82

NOTE 59p.; Paper presented at the Meeting of the Illinois Speech and Theatre Association (Peoria, IL, November 1982).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Classroom Communication; *Communication Skills; Educational Research; *Inservice Teacher Education; Interpersonal Communication; Models; Speech Communication; State Surveys; *Teacher Workshops

IDENTIFIERS Illinois; Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to determine the feasibility and availability of inservice communication skills workshops for Illinois elementary and secondary school teachers. Twenty-four college communication department administrators responded to questions regarding the availability of such workshops, and 174 public school district superintendents responded to questions regarding the demand for and feasibility of such inservice workshops. The college administrators indicated that only three departments had offered workshops or seminars on communication skills for public school teachers, but that those three workshops had been well attended by both public school teachers and teacher education students. Fifty-six district superintendents reported that no teachers in their school district had attended workshops on communication skills within the preceding 2 years. While most expressed a willingness to release teachers to attend workshops, they identified several problems with workshops, such as geographical distance, scheduling, and expense. An excellent model for such workshops is that offered by the department of speech at Pennsylvania State University. It is offered with convenient scheduling throughout the Commonwealth. Three courses cover (1) development of communicative behavior in children, (2) use of oral communication in the classroom, and (3) teacher use of interpersonal communication in the classroom. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224057

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Expanding Educational Horizons in Illinois: The Preparation of Public School Teachers as Effective Communicators

by

Frank E. Parcells
Assistant Professor
Department of Speech Communication
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, IL 61920

and

Marvin D. Kleinau
Associate Professor
Department of Speech Communication
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frank E. Parcells
Marvin D. Kleinau

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Illinois Speech and Theatre Association
1982 Convention
Communication Education Program

CS504031

Communication and Education: A Close Relationship

Communication has been associated with education throughout history from Quintilian to Dewey.[1] The importance of this association continues to grow, heightened by modern research and literature.[2] Berlo considers learning and communication as similar and complementary processes.[3] Parcells, Cardona, and Kleinau contend that all human beings are educated through experience with others and other things in the world. Thus, when interaction exists through an interchange of verbal and/or nonverbal communication between oneself and another or another thing, a relationship is established and learning occurs resulting in education.[4] Clearly this suggests the centrality of communication as a fundamental methodology of education. Lynn claims that "contemporary educational literature generally agrees that the essence of teaching is communication;"[5] therefore, communication is essential in teaching.

Classroom Teachers as Effective Communicators: A Historical Perspective on Their Preparation

Speech communicators and educators have historically focused only limited attention on the preparation of non-speech teachers as effective classroom communicators through pre-service or in-service training.[6] Two dissertations focus on the pre- and post-baccalaureate development of communication instruction for public school teachers.

Anderson surveyed 458 National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accredited undergraduate colleges in 1970, while Lynn surveyed 300 NCATE accredited graduate universities in 1974.[7] Anderson found that 122 institutions (27%) offered one or more undergraduate speech communication courses designed for teacher trainees and only 19 schools (4%) required such a course of teacher education students.[8] Lynn reported that 105 institutions (35%) offered one or more graduate courses involving classroom communication for practicing teachers.[9] Both studies show that the development of communication courses for teachers is a relatively new phenomena with the greatest growth occurring since 1965.[10] This lack of substantial course implementation prior to 1965 does not supplant a documented interest and concern over the years for the concept of speech training for all elementary and secondary school teachers.

The need for teacher training in communication, first emphasizing just speech (oral communication) and later adding other dimensions of communication, is obvious through a historical examination of communication education literature.[11] First, Rousseau revealed the inadequacy of speech training for public school teachers in 1922,[12] and numerous appeals advocating the training of all teachers in speech and communication skills followed.[13] Second, research since 1930 indicates the need for communication preparation of teachers.[14] Third, efforts by the Speech Communication Association

consistently emphasize the importance of communication in teaching.[15] The significance of communication for teaching is, then, generally acknowledged by experts and academicians.[16]

Regardless of the recognition of the importance communication plays in teaching, only minimal progress in communication training of non-speech teachers has been achieved through teacher education programs.[17] This situation is largely the result of increasingly limited budgets in schools of education, overloaded course requirements in teacher preparation programs, and the unavailability of staff-line positions in teacher education departments for faculty members specializing in communication education.[18] The development of curricula in teacher education programs to prepare communication-competent teachers is likely an unachievable task based on the abundance of inhibitory factors. However, the in-service training of non-speech, public school teachers in communication skills appears as an attractive and feasible alternative to pre-service coursework. Such communication preparation would not only allow for the diverse needs of teachers while insuring instruction in certain essential skills, but would also provide an attractive financial flexibility through the use of district workshops or converences, conveniently scheduled and offering optional graduate credit. This could be enticing as well as fiscally expedient for both public school administrators and teachers.

Purpose

There is no research on post-baccalaureate, communication workshops in Illinois available.[19] Thus a survey was conducted to determine the feasibility and availability of in-service communication workshops for Illinois elementary and secondary school teachers. Specifically, the research questions include:

1. What is the interest and demand (willingness to make the necessary sacrifices) of public school administrators in communication skill workshops for Illinois elementary and secondary school teachers? What type of workshops have teachers attended in the past?
2. What, if any, institutions in Illinois have offered communication skill workshops for non-speech, public school teachers? What type of workshops have been offered and how have they been accepted?

The purpose of this paper is to identify the status of, establish a need for, and propose an approach to implementing communication workshops for professional educators in Illinois public schools: the preparation of non-speech teachers as effective classroom communicators.

Method and Procedure

A descriptive-statistical method utilizing a systematic

process of inquiry and a survey technique served as the basis of this research project.[20] Two surveys were conducted to obtain information regarding in-service communication workshops for Illinois public school teachers from an administrative perspective. Following receipt of responses from a pilot study distributed in early May of 1982,[21] two separate questionnaires were mailed to communication department heads at institutions of higher learning and public school district administrators (See Appendix A, p. 40, and Appendix B, p.43, for sample instruments and introductory letters used in the surveys.).[22]

First, communication departmental administrators (i.e., usually chairman or chairperson) at Illinois colleges and universities (n = 58) were identified and questioned to determine the availability of in-service communication workshops (See Appendix C, p.46, for specific responses.).[23] Twenty-four administrators replied for a response rate of 41%. Second, administrators (i.e., superintendents) from the 1,012 Illinois public school districts were identified and polled to ascertain the feasibility of in-service communication workshops (See Appendix D, p.49, for specific responses.).[24] The sample (n = 174) of district superintendents represented the southern third of the state of Illinois. This was established by extending a line from the eastern border of Illinois at Robinson across the state to the western border at Alton.[25] Seventy-seven administra-

tors responded for a return rate of 44%.

Results of the Departmental Administrators' Survey

Background Information.[26] Respondents are administrators of a department responsible for communication curriculum and instruction in their respective Illinois university or college. Eighteen departments or divisions (75%) have either the term speech or communication or both in their title. The remaining departments or divisions (6 or 25%) are titled Humanities, Fine Arts, or Creative Arts. Most departmental administrators identified themselves as holding a title of chairman, chairperson, or a derivative of those titles (18 or 75%), while the remaining respondents (5 or 21%) hold a variety of academic titles, e.g. director, coordinator, and professor.

Communication Workshops Offered for Teachers.[27] Twenty-one department administrators (88%) report that no workshops or seminars on communication skills were offered for public school teachers in the last two years. Eleven administrators (46%) believe that there is presently no demand for a workshop in communication skills for non-speech teachers, while 4 chairpersons (17%) acknowledge a demand and 9 respondents (37%) offer no response or indicate uncertainty.

Three institutions (13%) offered communication workshops during the past two years. These workshops were well attended (240 enrollees) by both public school teachers (178 enrollees) and students in teacher education programs (62 enrollees).

No enrollment limitations or restrictions were place on any of the workshops and no individuals desiring to attend were turned away. Workshops were held in public and nursery schools and on college and university campuses. All topics concerned communication skills and ranged from curricular design to discipline in the building of relationships.

Communication Education: Faculty and Curriculum.[28]

Thirteen of the responding departments are staffed with faculty numbering less than ten persons; 4 departments (17%) employ between ten and fifteen faculty; and, 7 departments (29%) are staffed with sixteen or more faculty members. Of these communication department staffs, 6 (25%) employ one faculty member specializing in communication education, but only 4 departments have two or more communication education specialists. Thirteen departments (54%) employ no faculty member specializing in communication education. Many departments (11 or 46%) offer no communication education course in their regular class schedule; however, 13 departments (54%) regularly schedule a course in communication education. These courses are predominantly methods classes for the teaching of speech at the elementary or secndary school level with some secondary activity courses also scheduled. Only 2 departments offer graduate courses in communication education.

Interpreting the Departmental Administrators' Survey

Most college and university departments responsible for

the instruction of communication in Illinois clearly indicate such accountability through their titles. Any emphasis on communication education appears to be burried within many departments as an attempt to provide only those courses essential for the certification of secondary school speech teaching majors. This is also reflected through the titles of communication education courses offered regularly in the class schedule. These are primarily methods of activity courses for high school speech teachers. Faculty members specializing in communication education represent a very small portion of the communication department or division staff. Again, this suggests that the focus of communication education in Illinois colleges and universities is, predominantly, limited to the preparation of secondary school speech teachers.

The speech teacher-preparation approach to communication education in a time of declining teacher education enrollments is among the major contributing factors for the neglect of communication instruction for non-speech teachers. While few communication departmental administrators acknowledge a demand for in-service teacher workshops on communication skills, such an attitude may be more indicative of attempts to maintain status quo speech education than an accurate reflection of public school needs. It seems unlikely that many communication department chairpersons are in contact with public school administrators or teachers on a regular basis

and even more unlikely that their attitude reflects an understanding of elementary and secondary school communication needs.

In addition to the more traditional college and university campus locations in which some workshops were offered, many were conducted in public and nursery schools. This reflects a new approach to communication instruction--bringing the course to the students rather than the students to the course. Assuming the success of this method seems warranted, based on the number of teachers enrolled in these workshops. The diversity of topics offered in the communication workshops implies that a flexibility of content to meet the unique needs of different teaching situations and different teachers contributed to the success of these workshops. The fact that the efforts of only 3 departments offering workshops during the past two years account for 178 enrollees seems evidence enough of elementary and secondary educator interest.

Results of the Public School Administrators' Survey

Background Information.[29] Respondents are Illinois school district administrators who identified themselves predominantly as superintendents (76 or 99%). Surveyed administrators represent grades kindergarten through eight in elementary school districts (35 or 45%) and grades kindergarten through twelve in unit school districts (31 or 40%).

while only 11 superintendents (14%) are agents for grades nine through twelve in secondary school districts. Most public school districts (52 or 68%) employ less than fifty teachers and only 25 districts (32%) employ fifty or more teachers.

Communication Workshops Offered for Teachers.[30] Fifty-six superintendents (73%) report that no teachers in their school district attended workshops on communication skills within the past two years. However, 17 districts (22%) have teachers who attended one or more communication workshops and, of those districts, 11 (69%) sent five or fewer teachers.[31] Most of these workshops (7 or 44%) were held within a school district; 5 (31%) were workshops offered at a college or university; and, 4 workshops (25%) were held at other locations, e.g., conferences of different professional associations in various citites.

Communication workshops were sponsored by a variety of sources, including: 1) professional organizations cooperating with colleges or public school districts (7 workshops or 44%); 2) the Illinois State Board of Education (5 or 31%); 3) colleges and universities (2 or 12%); and, 4) individual school districts (2 or 13%). Workshop topics concerned communication skills and ranged from teacher effectiveness training to reading. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and Edwardsville, McKendree

College, and Olney Central College were identified as sponsoring institutions offering communication workshops.

Interest, Demand, and Conditions Favoring Communication Workshops.[32] Forty-two superintendents (55%) express a willingness to release teachers up to 3 days per school year to attend a communication workshop; 17 administrators (22%) stipulate no release time; and, 11 signify agreement to release teachers from four days a semester to one day a week per semester. Most district administrators (53 or 69%) favor providing teachers with some type of reimbursement for their attendance at a workshop from partial expenses or paid release time to complete expenses, while only 17 superintendents (22%) would offer no reimbursement at all.

Many school administrators would not (29 or 38%) or probably would not (25 or 32%) require teacher participation in a communication workshop and just 10 superintendents (13%) would consider requiring teacher participation. Forty-three administrators (56%) estimate that up to five teachers from each district would participate in such a workshop, while only 9 superintendents (11%) calculated teacher workshop attendance from each district at more than five individuals.

Administrators identify problems encountered with teacher workshops as: 1) too distant, geographically (33 or 27%); 2) inconveniently scheduled (32 or 26%); 3) too expensive (26 or 21%); 4) inappropriate topics (21 or 17%); and, 5)

other difficulties (10 or 8%), e.g., not practical, lack of free time, and availability and quality of substitute teachers.

Interpreting the Public School Administrators' Survey

While most public school districts in Illinois report no teacher participation in communication workshops during the past two years, the fact that 17 districts note teacher participation is of particular interest. This is significant since no lobbying point of departure providing consolidation and central organization for these workshops has existed or does exist. This suggests that many of the communication workshops were the result of individual teacher initiative or specific school efforts with mere cooperation of professional organizations upon invitation. This awareness of need for communication instruction of elementary and secondary school teachers is most encouraging as a movement toward strengthening the quality of public education. The diversity of workshop topics meeting the unique needs of different teachers in different situations, in addition to the notion of bringing the workshop to the teacher are important ingredients in extending higher education opportunity to those who otherwise might be neglected.

Most school district administrators display a willingness to grant reasonable amounts of release time and provide some type of reimbursement for expenses of teachers attending a

communication workshop. Superintendents are reluctant to require teacher participation and estimate that as many as five teachers per district might attend a workshop. These responses present a foavorable picture for the feasibility of public school teacher communication workshops. However, complications are suggested by superintendents. Regarding problems encountered in teacher workshops, administrators believe that it is essential that workshops be financially expedient, geographically accessible, topically appropriate, and conveniently scheduled. Thus, while interest is apparent and cooperation is implied, a communication workshop will be evaluated not only by its effect on teaching but also be specified criteria for the workshop situation and presentation itself. In other words, there is no blanket endorsement of the communication workshop concept by public school superintendents. Rather, they exercise a cautious receptivity toward workshops on communication skills for elementary and secondary school, non-speech teachers.

Pennsylvania State University's Teacher Workshop Program: A Model for the Communication Instruction of Public School Educators

The Department of Speech at Pennsylvania State University received a grant from the U.S. Office of Education in 1966 to develop an in-service training program for non-speech teachers that would enhance classroom communication competence.[33] This program is offered throughout the

commonwealth of Pennsylvania and has met with enthusiastic success in terms of both teacher workshop participation and acknowledged enhancement of classroom teaching effectiveness.[34] Program enrollment is a story of tremendous growth and expansion. In the first two years of existence, 3,500 teachers were enrolled and today the program has reached more than 6,000 Pennsylvania educators.[35]

The benefit of this type of program to elementary and secondary school teachers is summarized by Dauria, Bluman, and Rhodes as one of communication growth and development from a two-fold perspective.

> Teachers in all disciplines can benefit from learning principles and skills of effective communication. Since communication is an essential part of teaching, it was assumed that improving a teacher's communication would in turn improve his or her teaching.... Few teachers [in the program] thought about problems in their teaching from a communication point of view. The Teacher Workshop Program gave the teachers an opportunity to focus on the communication variables in the teaching transaction....We applied our understanding of communication to teacher-student classroom interaction. In doing so, teachers were encouraged to view teaching from a "dual perspective," analyzing the sources and consequences of their own behavior as well as the behavior of their students.[36]

Workshops in this program are offered based upon careful consideration of many factors which generate goals such as: 1) minimizing travel time and expense for course instructors; 2) maximizing convenience for the attending teachers; and, 3) guaranteeing sufficient instructional time for a comprehensive scrutiny of concepts and their application to teacher experiences.[37] Instructors from

Pennsylvania State University travel throughout the commonwealth and the workshops are held in various locations accessible to the enrolled teachers. Courses are offered in an all-day workshop format on 5 consecutive Saturdays during the regular school year. This insures few scheduling conflicts (as might be encountered during the summer months due to vacations or during the academic year on school days), eliminates the need for the use of substitute teachers, and maintains uninterrupted instruction from the regular teacher in public school classrooms. The result is teacher and administrator support, enthusiasm, and cooperation.[38]

Three separate courses covering different aspects of communication for graduate credit are offered as part of Pennsylvania State University's Workshop Program. All of the workshops require that teacher enrollees apply theoretical information to their own classroom teaching situations. First, The Development of Communicative Behavior in Children is a course designed for pre-school and early childhood educators which explores child communication development behaviors in relationship to the classroom situation. Second, The Use of Oral Communication in the Classroom is most appropriate for those teachers whose students have a basic mastery of language skills. This course introduces teachers to the classroom communication process and presents various communication instructional methods which are applied in the classroom. Third, Teacher Use of Interpersonal Communication in the Classroom allows teachers to explore class-

communication processes and relationships based on their own classroom communication behavior.[39] Thus, the overall program concerns communication competence and stresses classroom communication processes and interpersonal communication, and language development in children.[40]

The Pennsylvania State University Communication Workshop Program serves as an excellent model for a statewide effort to establish a series of graduate credit generating, in-service workshops for non-speech, elementary and secondary school teachers and increase communication competence in public school teaching. The program is financially solvent, conveniently scheduled, topically relevant, enthusiastically accepted, and evaluated as effective.[41]

The Challenge of Teaching Communication Competence: Implications for Illinois Educators

Nyquist and Booth outline the increasingly complex process of classroom communication as posing new challenges for public school teachers.

> Communication in educational environments is a complex process which requires of the teacher knowledge of basic communication principles and theories as well as competency in communicating to achieve various purposes in a variety of contexts. The interactive nature of contemporary classrooms and the visually-oriented, active, and challenging students of today pose for the teacher unique communication challenges.[42]

While prospective teachers may have an opportunity to receive communication instruction as part of their pre-

service training, elementary and secondary school teachers do not enjoy this educational advantage. Most in-service teachers are unlikely to obtain any post-baccalaureate instruction in communication, unless it is offered through workshops. The importance of communication in teaching is apparent based on recent research. Thus, its instruction for both pre-service and in-service teachers is acknowledged as significant. However, this paper's concern is to encourage the use of workshops for in-service teachers.

The Joint Education Committee for the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Illinois State Board of Education notes that "more extensive and well-planned professional development programs are needed by all teachers, beginning and experienced."[43] Such sentiments are echoed by the Speech and Theatre Curriculum Coordinator for the State Board of Education, but few communication workshops have been attempted in Illinois. A listing of communication education consultants is maintained by the State Board of Education and referrals are made upon receipt of a request for a workshop by a school district.[44]

The Speech Communication Association as well as leading speech communication and education experts continue to advocate the importance of communication training for public school teachers. Workshop programs on communication, such as the one at Pennsylvania State University, provide evidence of teacher and administrator receptivity in addition to enhancing

the quality of teaching.[45] However, the Illinois Speech and Theatre Association has taken no stance or action on this issue and many Illinois college and university departments of communication also avoid the issue.[46] Apparently, these institutions are more concerned with perpetuating traditional speech education (preparing secondary school speech teachers). The number of faculty specializing in communication education are limited, just as courses in that area are usually restricted to secondary school speech and sparingly scheduled. This occurs despite declining teacher education program enrollments and threatening high school teacher retrenchment. Communication department administrators express only minimal interest in providing in-service teachers with basic communication skills--an attitude which detracts from the quality of public education.

Within the limited constraints of certain criteria,[47] Illinois school district administrators support the concept of communication training for public school teachers. Superintendents are not interested in requiring workshop participation. However, many administrators estimate that as many as five teachers from each district might attend such a workshop and most agree to furnish at least partial reimbursement for teacher expenses. This indicates an atmosphere of cautious receptivity which, through careful planning and implementation, is appropriate for introducing communication workshops to Illinois. Strengthening the

case still further, the 3 Illinois higher education institutions which report offering workshops for teachers indicate high course enrollments.

The Illincis State Board of Education in cooperation with the Illinois Speech and Theatre Association has produced a booklet, Basic Oral Communication Skills: A Program Sequence for Illinois.[48] This document applies earlier competency research as communication skills appropriate for student achievement from pre-kindergarten thrcugh secondary levels.[49] The pedagogical application is for teachers to use these communication competencies to structure instructional methods and learning experiences which facilitate communication development and enhance education. This listing of communication skills is an excellent tool to assist in preparing teachers as more effective communicators, just as many other, up-to-date resources are also available and appropriate for communication workshops.[50]

A challenge to the Illinois Speech and Theatre Association to take the lead by providing direction toward achieving communication competence in public school teaching is in order. Efforts in this direction will enhance the quality of elementary and secondary school education in Illinois. Such a challenge, though, must be extended to other groups: the State Board of Education; secondary school speech teachers; and, college and university communication departments. The current availability of communication workshops is minimal

but the feasibility of offering workshops is very good. A cooperative effort between these groups could produce an effective workshop program on a statewide basis. Workshops, based on the Pennsylvania State University model, would be cost efficient, conveniently scheduled, geographically accessible, topically relevant, and result in an increased quality of teaching. An Illinois Communication Workshop Program could not only provide credit generating, graduate courses for elementary and secondary school teachers, but also serve simultaneously as a district-wide public school teacher workshop.

First, the Illinois Speech and Theatre Association should serve as a planning agent preparing a variety of workshop models representing different aspects of communication in different teaching situations. Second, the State Board of Education would cover the workshop instructor's transportation and lodging expenses and serve as the coordinating agency for the program. The Board would refer school district requests for workshops to the college or university communication department located closest to the requesting district. Third, the communication department should arrange workshop details directly with the school district and assign a faculty member or members as instructor (s). Each workshop would be offered both as a course for graduate credit and as a districtwide workshop simultaneously. Thus all teachers would be encouraged to attend and gain communication skills through the workshop, while those

teachers desiring graduate credit enroll in the workshop as a course through the conducting college or university. Diversity of educational situations may dictate that a series of workshops be offered in each school district to meet particular teaching needs. Fourth, secondary speech teachers in the requesting school district should assist in coordinating workshop activities, identifying district communication needs, and specifying workshop content. Finally, a cooperative effort on the part of all groups and individuals in promoting the concept of communication workshops is imperative for the success of this movement.

The call is now for a new movement of communication education in Illinois, expanding the boundaries beyond the training of speech teachers to the preparation of all teachers as effective communicators. This includes a new goal for speech communication higher educators as instructors of instructors, providing teachers with the skills necessary to encourage elementary and secondary school students to achieve communication competence. The inevitable result would be beneficial to society by assisting in child development and producing effectively functioning individuals who are capable of coping with one another in a complex world.[51]

ENDNOTES

[1] Relationships between education and communication have been established throughout history by many scholars from both areas. For example, Quintilian associated the rhetorical aspect of communication with education in the first century A.D., while Dewey's concept of shared experience as communication is of paramount importance in his twentieth century philosophy of education. See James Gouinlock, John Dewey's Philosophy of Value (New York: Humanities Press, 1972), pp. 258-263; and, Frederick M. Wheelock, Qunitilian as Educator (New York: Twayne, 1974).

[2] For example Larry L. Barker, ed., Communication in the Classroom (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1982); Ronald E. Bassett and Mary Jeanette Smythe, Communication and Instruction (New York: Harper and Row, 1979); Arthur A. Bellack, et al., The Language of the Classroom (New York: Teachers College Press, 1966); Pamela J. Cooper, Speech Communication for the Classroom Teacher (Dubuque, Iowa: Gorsuch-Scarisbrick, 1981); Donald K. Darnell, "Some Basics to Get Back to: A Transactional Perspective in Teaching-Learning," Communication Educatior, 27 (1978), pp. 277-285; Donald K. Darnell and Wayne Brockriede, Persons

Communicating (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976); Gustav W. Frederich, Kathleen M. Galvin, and Cassandra L. Book, Growing Together--Classroom Communication (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1976); N.L. Gage, ed., Handbook on Research in Teaching (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1969); L. Thomas Keith, Louis G. Tornatsky, and L. Eudora Pettigrew, "An Analysis of Verbal and Nonverbal Classroom Teaching Behaviors," The Journal of Experimental Education, 42 (1974), pp. 30-38; R.G. Martin, "Communication and the Act of Teaching: A Footnote to Models of Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education, 22 (1971), pp. 418-425; Gerald M. Phillips, David E. Butt, and Nancy J. Metzger, Communication in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974); Gavriel Salomon, Communication and Education (Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1981); Gene Stanford and Albert E. Roark, Human Interaction in Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974); Robert M.W. Travers, ed., Second Handbook on Reasearch in Teaching (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1973; and, Sarah Trenholm and Toby Rose, "The Compliant Communicator: Teacher Perceptions of Appropriate Classroom Behavior," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45 (1981), pp. 13-26.

[3] David K. Berlo, The Process of Communication (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1960), pp. 99-102.

[4] Frank E. Parcells, Ivan Cardona, and Marvin D. Kleinau, "Speech Communicators as Processors Innovating Education: An Integrative-Evaluative Goal Theory,"

unpublished manuscript submitted for publication, 1982. Available from the authors.

[5] Elizabeth Meagher Lynn, "In-Service Teacher Education in Classroom Communication," Communication Education, 26 (1977), p. 1.

[6] The concept of "effective" classroom communication is described by Lynn as "both (1) theory and practice in a wide range of specific communication skills, and (2) theoretical knowledge of classroom communication. See Lynn, "In-Service Teacher Education...," pp. 2-3. For a discussion of specific goals of classroom communication, see Jody L. Nyquist and James L. Booth, "Instructional Communication: A Basic Course for Teachers," Communication Education, 26 (1977), pp. 13-14.

[7] See Roy G. Anderson, "A Study of the Basic Speech Communication Course Designed Primarily for Classroom Teachers," Diss. University of Colorado 1970; and, Elizabeth Meagher Lynn, "A National Survey of Graduate Courses in Classroom Communication Theory and Skills Available to Practicing Elementary and Secondary Teachers," Diss. Indiana University 1974. See also Elizabeth M. Lynn, Improving Classroom Communication: Speech Communication Instruction for Teachers (Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and Speech Communication Association, 1976), pp. 30-56. Lynn summarizes both the Anderson dissertation and her own study in this compact text.

[8] See Lynn, Improving Classroom Communication..., pp. 31-36 and "In-Service Teacher Education...," p. 2.

[9] See Lynn, "In-Service Teacher Education...," p. 5.

[10] See Lynn, Improving Classroom Communication..., pp. 36-37.

[11] Materials were uncovered through a computer search of the Educational Resources Information Center system (ERIC). Morris Library, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 3 June 1982. Additional titles were realized from a review of indices. See Richard Leo Enos and Jeanne L. McClaran, eds., A Guide to Doctoral Dissertations in Communication Studies and Theater (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1978); Ronald J. Matlon, Index to Journals in Communication Studies through 1979 (Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association, 1980); and, Speech and Hearing: A Dissertation Bibliography (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1979).

[12] Lousene G. Rousseau, "Speech Education in the Normal Schools--A Survey," Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, 8 (1922), p. 217.

[13] See Donald C. Bryant, "Speech for Teachers," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 24 (1938), pp. 244-247; Preston H. Scott, "Speech Training for Teachers," The Southern Speech Journal, 8 (1942), pp. 33-36; Elvena Miller, "Speech Training for the Elementary Teacher," Western Speech, 6 (1942), pp. 2-5; Felix C. Robb, "The Speech Curriculum in the Teacher-Training

Program," The Southern Speech Journal, 14 (1949), pp. 229-232; Harry G. Barnes, "Basic Concepts of Speech Education," Speech Teacher, 1 (1952), pp. 14-19; Harold Lillywhite and Granville Basye, "Training the Teacher Candidate in Speech," Western Speech, 16 (1952), pp. 5-10; Oliver W. Nelson, "An In-Service Program in Speech for the Public Schools," Western Speech, 15 (1951), pp. 32-34; Grover A. Fuchs, "Speech in Teacher Training at Texas," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 40 (1954), pp. 293-298; Julia C. Piquette, "Needed: Adequate Speech Training for Elementary Education Majors," Speech Teacher, 9 (1960), pp. 276-277; Robert W. Vogelsang and Ernest E. Ettlich, "NDEA Institutes: A Challenge to Speech Education," Speech Teacher, 15 (1966), pp. 186-190; Douglas J. Pedersen, "The Teacher Workshop at Penn State," Today's Speech, 20 (1972), pp. 55-58; David C. Kleiman, "Student Teaching Seminars: Involving the Public Schools," Communication Education, 25 (1976), pp. 81-82; Lynn, "In-Service Teacher Education...," pp. 1-12; Nyquist and Booth, pp. 13-26; and, Arthur F. Dauria, Dale L. Bluman, and Steven C. Rhodes, "A Rhetorical Model of Teaching," Communication Education, 30 (1981), pp. 64-76.

[14] See C.P. Lahman, "Speech Education in Teacher-Training Institutions," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 16 (1930), pp. 42-61; Seth A. Fessenden, "The Classroom Teacher is not a Public Speaker," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 29 (1943), pp. 92-93; Virgil A. Anderson, "Speech Needs and

Abilities of Prospective Teachers," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 30 (1944), pp. 221-225; Committee on Teacher Education, "Speech in Teacher Education," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 32 (1946), pp. 80-102; Herold Lillywhite, "Speech Needs of Teachers," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 32 (1946), pp. 496-501; Marion Emory Shea, "Education of the Elementary School Teacher in Communication Skills," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 33 (1947), pp. 222-224; Burton H. Byers, "Speech in Teacher Training," The Southern Speech Journal, 13 (1947), pp. 50-53; Herold Lillywhite, Waldo Phelps, and Granville Basye, "Speech Proficiency in Teaching as Related to Teacher-Training Curricula," Western Speech, 14 (1950), pp. 5-14; Maxine Trauernicht, "Speech Proficiency of Teachers in Training," Speech Teacher, 13 (1964), pp. 16-20; Paul Walwick, "The Status of Speech Instruction in the Elementary Schools," Diss. Pennsylvania State University 1967; Donald K. Orban, "A Survey of Speech Education in the Public High Schools of the United States, 1969-1970," Diss. Indiana University 1973; Anderson; and, Lynn, "A National Survey of...."

[15] See Lynn, "In-Service Teacher Education...," p. 2 She cites, for example, Douglas Ehninger, "Report of the Committee on the Scope of Rhetoric and the Place of Rhetorical Studies in Higher Education," in the Prospect of Rhetoric: Report of the National Development Project, ed. Lloyd F. Bitzer and Edwin Black (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 216; Robert J. Kibler and Larry

L. Barker, eds., Conceptual Frontiers in Speech Communication: Report of the New Orleans Conference of Research and Instructional Development (New York: Speech Association of America, 1969), pp. 28-29; and, P. Judson Newcombe and R.R. Allen, eds., New Horizons for Teacher Education in Speech Communication: Report of the Memphis Conference of Teacher Education (Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook, 1974), pp. 134-139.

[16] See Lynn, Improving Classroom Communication..., pp. 8-25.

[17] See Anderson; and, Lynn, "In-Service Teacher Education...," p. 3.

[18] Lynn, "In-Service Teacher Education...," p. 3.

[19] ERIC computer search; and, review of past issues of the Journal of the Illinois Speech and Theatre Association and communication indices. See note 11.

[20] See Earl R. Babbie, Survey Research Methods (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1973); Charles H. Backstrom and Gerald Hursh-Cesar, Survey Research, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1981); Isadore Newman, Basic Procedures in Conducting Survey Research (Akron, Ohio: University of Akron, 1976); and, Raymond K. Tucker, Richard L. Weaver II, and Cynthia Berryman-Fink, Research in Speech Communication (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1981), pp. 89-102 and 181-185.

[21] Three departmental administrators (n = 58) and seven public school administrators (n = 174) constituted the

sample population of the pilot study. All pilot study questionnaires were returned and indicated the appropriateness of the instrument for the two surveys.

[22] Only minor revisions to the pilot study instrument were required and, although both introductory letters to the pilot study and regular survey bear the same date, none of the revised questionnaires were mailed until all pilot study instruments were received and evaluated.

[23] A review of current Illinois college and university catalogs (including community colleges) was used to determine which institutions offered communication programs. See Directory of Graduate Programs in the Speech Communication Arts and Sciences, 1981-82 ed. (Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association, 1981); and, Darrell Allen Negley, "Speech Programs in Illinois Community Colleges," Diss. Indiana University 1973.

[24] Illinois State Board of Education, 1980-1981 Illinois Public School Districts and Schools (Springfield, Illinois: Illinois State Board of Education, 1981), pp. 64-122.

[25] A line extending across the state of Illinois from the eastern border to the western border (a latitude of 39° north). See Road Atlas: United States, Canada, Mexico (Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1979), pp. 30-31.

[26] See Appendix A, p.40, and Appendix C, p.46, question numbers 1 and 2.

[27] See Appendix A, pp. 40 - 41, and Appendix C, pp. 46 - 48, question numbers 4-13.

[28] See Appendix A, pp. 40 - 41, and Appendix C, pp. 46 - 48, question number 3 and numbers 14-16.

[29] See Appendix B, p. 43 , and Appendix D, p. 49 , question numbers 1-3.

[30] See Appendix B, pp. 43 - 44, and Appendix D, pp. 49 - 51, question numbers 4-9.

[31] Percentages expressed for districts reporting that teachers attended one or more communication workshops are based on 16 respondents (100%).

[32] See Appendix B, p. 44 , and Appendix D, p. 51, question numbers 10-15.

[33] See Arthur F. Dauria, Dale L. Bluman, and Steven C. Rhodes, "A Rhetorical Model of Teaching," Communication Education, 30 (1981), pp. 64-65; and, Douglas J. Pedersen, "The Teacher Workshop Program at Penn State," Today's Speech, 20 (1972), pp. 55-58. The workshop program was originally funded by Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Grant No. 67-33336 (Region J, Pennsylvania) through the U.S. Office of Education.

[34] See Pedersen, p. 56 and p. 57. See also evaluation reports for the workshop program, Bureau of Curriculum Development, Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; and, Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

[35] See Dauria, Bluman, and Rhodes, p. 64; and, Pedersen, p. 55.

[36] Dauria, Bluman, and Rhodes, p. 65. Bracketed material added by author.

[37] Pedersen, p. 57.

[38] Pedersen, pp. 56-57.

[39] See Lynn, Improving Classroom Communication..., p. 52. and "In-Service Teacher Education...," p. 9; and, Pedersen, pp. 56-57.

[40] Lynn, "In-Service Teacher Education...," p. 9.

[41] See Dauria, Bluman, and Rhodes, pp. 64-65; Lynn, Improving Classroom Communication..., pp. 52-53 and "In-Service Teacher Education...," p. 9; and, Pedersen, pp. 53-58.

[42] Nyquist and Booth, p. 26.

[43] Joint Education Committee of the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Board of Higher Education, "Recruitment and Retention of Teachers," Research Report, 1982, summary. Available from either Board, Springfield.

[44] Telephone interview with Mina Halliday, Curriculum Coordinator of Speech and Theatre, Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, 14 July 1982.

[45] See Lynn, Improving Classroom Communication..., pp. 50-57 and "In-Service Teacher Education...," pp. 8-10.

[46] Telephone interview with Phillip Gray, Chairman, Illinois Speech and Theatre Association-Speech Education Committee, 13 July 1982. Also Halliday interview.

[47] Such constraints include: (1) financial expedience;

(2) geographic accessibility; (3) topical appropriateness; and (4) convenience of scheduling. See "Interpreting the Public School Administrators' Survey," p. 12, of this report.

[48] Illinois State Board of Education. Basic Oral Communication Skills: A Program Sequence for Illinois. Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education, 1981.

[49] For example R.R. Allen and Kenneth L. Brown, eds., Developing Communication Competence in Children (Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1976); Carl Larson, Phil Backlund, Mark Redmond, and Alton Barbour, Assessing Functional Communication (Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and Speech Communication Association, 1978); and, Barbara Sundene Wood, Development of Functional Communication Competencies: Pre-K--Grade 6 and Grades 7--12 (Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and Speech Communication Association, 1977).

[50] For example Barker; Bassett and Smythe; Cooper; and, Frank B. May, To Help Children Communicate (Columbus: Merrill, 1980). See also notes 2, 6, 7, and 13 in this paper.

[51] See Parcells, Cardona and Kleinau.

BIBILIOGRAPHY

Allen, R.R. and Kenneth L. Brown, eds. Developing Communication Competence in Children. Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1976.

Anderson, Roy G. "A Study of the Basic Speech Communication Course Designed Primarily for Classroom Teachers." Diss. University of Colorado 1970.

Anderson, Virgil A. "Speech Needs and Abilities of Prospectve Teachers." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 30 (1944), pp. 221-225.

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1973.

Backstrom, Charles H. and Gerald Hursh-Cesar. Survey Research, 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1981.

Barker, Larry L., ed. Communication in the Classroom. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Barnes, Harry G. "Basic Concepts of Speech Education." Speech Teacher, 1 (1952), pp. 14-19.

Bassett, Ronald E. and Mary Jeanette Smythe. Communication and Instruction. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.

Bellack, Arthur A., et al. The Language of the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Berlo, David K. The Process of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1960.

Bryant, Donald C. "Speech for Teachers." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 24 (1938), pp. 244-247.

Byers, Burton H. "Speech in Teacher Training." The Southern Speech Journal, 13 (1947), pp. 50-53.

Committee on Teacher Education. "Speech in Teacher Education." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 32 (1946), pp. 80-102.

Cooper, Pamela J. Speech Communication for the Classroom Teacher. Dubuque, Iowa: Gorsuch-Scarisbrick, 1981.

Darnell, Donald K. and Wayne Brockriede. Persons Communicating. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

_____. "Some Basics to Get Back to: A Transactional Perspective in Teaching-Learning." Communication Education, 27 (1978), pp. 277-285.

Dauria, Arthur F., Dale L. Bluman, and Steven C. Rhodes. "A Rhetorical Model of Teaching." Communication Education, 30 (1981), pp. 64-76.

Directory of Graduate Programs in Speech Communication Arts and Sciences, 1981-1982 ed. Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association, 1981.

Ehninger, Douglas. "Report of the Committee on the Scope of Rhetoric and the Place of Rhetorical Studies in

Higher Education." In The Prosepct of Rhetoric: Report of the National Development Project. Eds. Lloyd F. Bitzer and Edwin Black. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Enos, Richard Leo and Jeanne L. McClaran, eds. A Guide to Doctoral Dissertations in Communication Studies and Theater. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1978.

ERIC Computer Search. Morris Library, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. 3 June 1982.

Fessenden, Seth A. "The Classroom Teacher is not a Public Speaker." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 29 (1943), pp. 92-93.

Frederich, Gustav W., Kathleen M. Galvin, and Cassandra L. Book. Growing Together--Classroom Communication. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1976.

Fuchs, Grover A. "Speech in Teacher Training in Texas." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 40 (1954), pp. 293-298.

Gage, N.L., ed. Handbook on Research in Teaching. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1969.

Gouinlock, James. John Dewey's Philosophy of Value. New York: Humanities Press, 1972.

Gray, Phillip. Telephone Interview. Chairman, Illinois Speech and Theatre Association-Speech Education Committee. 13 July 1982.

Halliday, Mina. Telephone Interview. Curriculum Coordinator

of Speech and Theatre, Illinois State Board of Education. 14 July 1982.

Illinois State Board of Education. Basic Oral Communication Skills: A Program Sequence for Illinois. Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education, 1981.

_____. 1980-1981 Illinois Public School Districts and Schools. Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education.

Joint Education Committee of the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Board of Higher Education. "Recruitment and Retention of Teachers." Research Report, 1982.

Keith, L. Thomas, Louis G. Tornatsky, and L. Eudora Pettigrew. "An Analysis of Verbal and Nonverbal Classroom Teaching Behaviors." The Journal of Experimental Education, 42 (1974), pp. 30-38.

Kibler, Robert J. and Larry L. Barker, eds. Conceptual Frontiers in Speech Communication: Report of the New Orleans Conference of Research and Instructional Development. New York: Speech Association of America, 1969.

Kleiman, David C. "Student Teaching Seminars: Involving the Public Schools." Communication Education, 25 (1976), pp. 81-82.

Lahman, C.P. "Speech Education in Teacher Training Institutions." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 16 (1930), pp. 42-61.

Larson, Carl, Phil Backlund, Mark Redmond, and Alton Barbour. Assessing Functional Communication. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and Speech Communication Association, 1978.

Lillywhite, Herold and Granville Basye. "Training the Teacher Candidate in Speech." Western Speech, 16 (1952), pp. 5-10.

_____. "Speech Needs of Teachers." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 32 (1946), pp. 222-224.

_____, Waldo Phelps, and Granville Basye. "Speech Proficiency in Teaching as Related to Teacher-Training Curricula." Western Speech, 14 (1950), pp. 5-14.

Lynn, Elizabeth Meagher. "A National Survey of Graduate Courses in Classroom Communication Theory and Skills Available to Practicing Elementary and Secondary Teachers." Diss. Indiana University 1974.

_____. Improving Classroom Communication: Speech Communication Instruction for Teachers. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and Speech Communication Association, 1976.

_____. "In-Service Teacher Education in Classroom Communication." Communication Education, 26 (1977), pp. 1-12.

Martin, R.G. "Communication and the Act of Teaching: A

Footnote to Models of Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education, 22 (1971), pp. 418-425.

Matlon, Ronald J. Index to Journals in Communication Studies through 1979. Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association, 1980.

May, Frank B. To Help Children Communicate. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1980.

Miller, Elvena. "Speech Training for the Elementary Teacher," Western Speech, 6 (1942), pp. 2-5.

Negley, Darrell Allen. "Speech Programs in Illinois Community Colleges." Diss. Indiana University 1973.

Nelson, Oliver W. "An In-Service Program in Speech for the Public Schools." Western Speech, 15 (1951), pp. 32-34.

Newman, Isadore. Basic Procedures in Conducting Survey Research. Akron, Ohio: University of Akron, 1976.

Nyquist, Judy L. and James L. Booth. "Instructional Communication: A Basic Course for Teachers." Communication Education, 26 (1977), pp. 13-26.

Orban, Donald K. "A Survey of Speech Education in the Public High Schools of the United States, 1969-1970." Diss. Indiana University 1973.

Parcells, Frank E., Ivan Cardona, and Marvin D. Kleinau. "Speech Communicators as Processors Innovating Education: An Integrative-Evaluative Goal Theory." Manuscript submitted for publication, 1982.

Pedersen, Douglas J. "The Teacher Workshop at Penn State."

Today's Speech, 20 (1972), pp. 55-58.

Phillips, Gerald M., David E. Butt, and Nancy J. Metzger. Communication in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974.

Piquette, Julia C. "Needed: Adequate Speech Training for Elementary Education Majors." Speech Teacher, 9 (1960), pp. 276-277.

Road--Atlas: United States, Canada, Mexico. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1979.

Robb, Felix C. "The Speech Curriculum in the Teacher-Training Program." The Southern Speech Journal, 14 (1949), pp. 229-232.

Rousseau, Lousene G. "Speech Education in the Normal Schools--A Survey." Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, 8 (1922), pp. 210-217.

Salamon, Gavriel. Communication and Education. Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1981.

Scott, Preston H. "Speech Training for Teachers." The Southern Speech Journal, 8 (1942), pp. 33-36.

Shea, Marion Emory. "Education of the Elementary School Teacher in Communication Skills." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 33 (1947), pp. 222-224.

Speech and Hearing: A Dissertation Bibliography. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1979.

Stanford, Gene and Albert E. Roark. Human Interaction in

Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974.

Trauernicht, Maxine. "Speech Proficiency of Teachers in Training." Speech Teacher, 13 (1964), pp. 16-20.

Travers, Robert M.W., ed. Second Handbook on Research in Teaching. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1973.

Trenholm, Sarah and Toby Rose. "The Compliant Communicator: Teacher Perceptions of Appropriate Classroom Behavior." Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45 (1981), pp. 13-26.

Tucker, Raymond K., Richard L. Weaver II, and Cynthia Berryman-Fink. Research in Speech Communication. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Walwick, Paul. "The Status of Speech Instruction in the Elementary Schools." Diss. Pennsylvania State University 1967.

Wheelock, Frederick M. Quintilian as Educator. New York: Twayne, 1974.

Wood, Barbara Sundene. Development of Functional Communication Competencies: Pre-K--Grade 6 and Grades 7--12. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and Speech Communication Association, 1977.

Vogelsang, Robert W. and Ernest E. Ettlich. "NDEA Institutes: A Challenge to Speech Education." Speech Teacher, 15 (1966), pp. 186-190.

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATORS' SURVEY: QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTRODUCTORY LETTERS

COMMUNICATION EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE
(Department Administrators)

Directions: Please answer each of the applicable questions that follow by circling the most appropriate response or by supplying the requested information in writing. Your assistance is appreciated.

1. What is the exact name of your department?_____

_____

2. What is the exact title of your position with that department?_____

_____

3. What is the number of full-time teaching faculty in your department?

_____

4. Has your department offered any workshops or seminars on communication skills for public school teachers in the last two years?

A. No B. Yes

If you answered "yes" to question 4, please respond to questions 5 through 12. If you responded "no" to question 4, then skip questions 5 through 12 and begin again with question 13.

5. How many seminars or workshops on communication skills for public school teachers has your department offered in the last two years?

_____

6. Where were the workshops or seminars held?

A. a public school
B. on your college or university campus
C. on a community college campus
D. Other, please specify_____

7. What was the topic or general content area of each of the workshops or seminars?

Course 1:_____

Course 2:_____

Course 3:_____

8. How many students were enrolled in each course and how many of those students were full time teachers during the time of the course offering?

	Total Enrollment	No. of Students Teaching/Enrolled
Course 1:		
Course 2:		
Course 3:		

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE!

9. Was the workshop or seminar enrollment limited to any specific number of students?

Course 1: A. No B. Yes (1-15 students) C. Yes (16-30 students) D. Yes (more than 30)

Course 2: A. No B. Yes (1-15) C. Yes (16-30) D. Yes (31+)

Course 3: A. No B. Yes (1-15) C. Yes (16-30) D. Yes (31+)

10. Did you turn prospective students away from the seminars or workshops?

Course 1: A. No B. Yes (1-5 students) C. Yes (6 to 10 students) D. Yes (more than 10)

Course 2: A. No B. Yes (1-5) C. Yes (6-10) D. Yes (11+)

Course 3: A. No B. Yes (1-5) C. Yes (6-10) D. Yes (11+)

11. Have any of these seminars or workshops been required of students as part of the college/school/department of education at your university or college entitlement for teaching certificate process?

A. No B. Yes

12. What are the names of the faculty members in your department who have instructed the seminars offered by your department?

Course 1 Instructor:_____

Course 2 Instructor:_____

Course 3 Instructor:_____

13. Is there presently a demand for a seminar or workshop in communication skills for public school teachers?

A. No B. Yes

14. Is there a full time faculty member(s) specializing in communication education in your department?

A. No B. Yes (1 faculty member) C. Yes (2 faculty) D. Yes (3 faculty) E. Yes (4 or more faculty)

15. Is a course(s) in communication education regularly offered in your department's teaching schedule?

A. No B. Yes

16. If you answered "yes" to question 15, what is the name of that course(s)?

Course Title:_____

Course Title:_____

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!
Please return it to us in the included stamped envelope.

Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Department of Speech Communication

Date: May 3, 1982

To: Department Chairman

From: Marvin D. Kleinau and Frank E. Parcells

Please excuse the formality of this note. However, time and expense necessitate this type of correspondence.

This questionnaire is an attempt to ascertain the status of workshops or seminars on communication skills for public school teachers in colleges and universities throughout the state of Illinois.

Your participation is appreciated! Please complete the included questionnaire and return it in the addressed and stamped envelope enclosed with this mailing. Time is essential, so our deadline is not far away. Your return of this questionnaire by May 17 is very important.

Thank you!

Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Department of Speech Communication

Date: May 3, 1982

To: Department Chairman

From: Marvin D. Kleinau and
Frank E. Parcells

Please forgive the formality of this note. However, time and expense dictate such action. This survey is an attempt to assess the status of communication education for all classroom teachers (K-12) in public schools: what is the Illinois college or university doing in communication for the public school teacher? Your assistance by prompt completion of the questionnaire will be greatly appreciated and most helpful. As with all surveys there is a deadline and ours is June 1, 1982.

Thank you!

APPENDIX B

PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' SURVEY: QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTRODUCTORY LETTERS

COMMUNICATION EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE
(Public School Administrators)

Directions: Please answer each of the applicable questions that follow by circling the most appropriate response or by supplying the requested information in writing. Your assistance is appreciated.

1. What is the exact title of your position with the school district?

_____

2. What level(s) of education is included in your school district?

   A. Elementary (K-8) B. Secondary (9-12) C. Combination (K-12)

3. What is the number of full-time teachers employed by your school district?

_____

4. Have any teachers in your school district attended a workshop(s) or seminar(s) on communication skills in the past two years?

   A. No B. Yes If "yes," how many seminars were attended?_____

If you responded "yes" to question 4, please answer questions 5 through 9. If you responded "no" to question 4, then skip questions 5 through 9 and continue, beginning with question 10.

5. Where was the workshop(s) or seminar(s) held?

   A. a district school
   B. a college or university
   C. a community college
   D. Other, please specify_____

6. Who offered the seminar(s) or workshop(s)?

   A. a school district
   B. a college or university
   C. a community college
   D. Illinois State Board of Education
   E. Other, please specify_____

7. How many teachers attended the workshop(s) or seminar(s)?_____

8. What was the topic(s) of the seminar(s) or workshop(s)?

   Course 1:_____

   Course 2:_____

   Course 3:_____

9. If the seminar(s) or workshop(s) was offered by a college or university, please specify the name of the institution(s) and its sponsoring department(s)

   Institution 1:_____

   Department 1:_____

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE!

Institution 2:_____

Department 2:_____

Institution 3:_____

Department 3:_____

10. Are you willing to provide release time for teachers to attend a workshop or seminar on communication skills?

No time release	Up to 3 days per year	Between 4 and 6 days per year	Up to 3 days per semester	1 Day a week per semester
5	4	3	2	1

11. Are you willing to provide financial reimbursement for teachers who attend such a seminar or workshop?

Complete reimbursement for travel, lodging and tuition	Reimbursement for tuition but not for lodging or travel	Partial reimbursement for overall expenses	No cash reimbursement but provide paid release time	No reimbursement
5	4	3	2	1

12. What is the total number of teachers in your district that you estimate might attend such a seminar, if such a workshop were available without time or enrollment restriction?

_____

13. Would you consider requiring participation of teachers in your district for a seminar or workshop on communication skills?

Would require participation	Would consider requiring	Neutral	Would probably not require	Would definitely not require
5	4	3	2	1

14. What problems have you observed or discerned with existing teacher workshops or seminars?

A. too expensive
B. too distant (geographically)
C. inconveniently scheduled
D. inappropriate topics
E. Other, please specify_____

15. What problems do you believe might be encountered with a workshop or seminar on communication skills for public school teachers?

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!
Please return it to us in the included stamped envelope.

Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Department of Speech Communication

Date: May 3, 1982

To: School District Superintendent

From: Marvin D. Kleinau and Frank E. Parcells

Please excuse the formality of this note. However, time and expense necessitate this type of correspondence.

This questionnaire is an attempt to ascertain the status of workshops or seminars on communication skills for public school teachers and the feasibility of developing such workshops or seminars.

Your participation is appreciated. It is important that you fill out the questionnaire, as it is your perception we are seeking. However, please feel welcome to contact your school district personnel for information. Time is essential, so our deadline is not far away. Your return of this questionnaire by May 17 is very important to us.

Thank you!

Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Department of Speech Communication

Date: May 3, 1982

To: School Superintendent

From: Marvin D. Kleinau and Frank E. Parcells

Please forgive the formality of this note. However, time and expense dictate such action. This survey is an attempt to ascertain the needs of public school teachers in the area of communication and determine the feasibility of developing seminars or workshops. It is important that you, as the district superintendent, respond directly to the items on this questionnaire. Please feel free to consult with any personnel in your school district, but the responses we desire must come from you. Your participation in this survey and return of the questionnaire in the addressed and stamped envelope included with this mailing will be greatly appreciated. As with all surveys there is a deadline and ours is June 1, 1982.

Thank you!

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF THE DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATORS' SURVEY

COMMUNICATION EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
(Department Administrators)

1. What is the exact name of your department?

Humanities Division 4 (17%)*
Department of Speech Communication 4 (17%)
Communication Division 3 (13%)
Division of Speech Communication 2 (8%)
Speech and Drama Department 1 (4%)
Communication and Theatre Department 1 (4%)
Communication Arts, Humanities, and Fine Arts Division 1 (4%)
Communication and Humanities Division 1 (4%)
Division of Humanities and Fine Arts 1 (4%)
Department of Communication 1 (4%)
Department of Communication Studies 1 (4%)
Department of Communication Arts 1 (4%)
Department of Speech Education 1 (4%)
Department of Creative Arts 1 (4%)
Department of Speech and Performing Arts 1 (4%)

2. What is the exact title of your position with that department?

Chairman 11 (46%)
Chairperson 4 (17%)
Director 3 (13%)
Chair 1 (4%)
Acting Chair 1 (4%)
Acting Chairperson 1 (4%)
Coordinator 1 (4%)
Professor 1 (4%)
No Response 1 (4%)

3. What is the number of full time teaching faculty in your department?

A. Under 3 persons 3 (13%)
B. From 3 to 6 persons 8 (33%)
C. From 7 to 9 persons 2 (8%)
D. From 10 to 15 persons 4 (17%)
E. More than 15 persons 7 (29%)

4. Has your department offered any workshops or seminars on communication skills for public school teachers in the last two years?

A. No 21 (88%) B. Yes 3 (13%)

Questions 5 through 12 apply to only departments offering workshops or seminars on communication skills for public school teachers in the last two years?

5. How many seminars or workshops on communication skills for public school teachers has your department offered in the last two years?

   A. One workshop 0
   B. Two workshops 1 (4%)
   C. Three workshops 0
   D. Four or more workshops 2 (8%)
   No Response 21 (88%)

6. Where were the workshops or seminars held? (22 no responses or 92%)

   Respondents (2 or 8%) noted:

   A. Public schools
   B. College or university campuses
   C. Nursery school

7. What was the topic or general content area of each of the workshops or seminars? (3 responses or 12%; 21 no responses or 88%)

8. How many students were enrolled in each course and how many of those students were full time teachers during the time of the course offering?

Topic or Content Area of Workshop	Enrollment Number Total	Teachers
Basic Communication Skills	30	NR
Communication in Curricular Design	9	2
Teaching Performance Courses in Speech	11	4
Communication in the Elementary School	40	30
Discipline as Relationship Building	120	120
Communication for the Classroom Teacher	30	30

9. Was the workshop or seminar enrollment limited to any specific number of students?

   All responded no.

10. Did you turn prospective students away from the seminars or workshops?

    All responded no.

11. Have any of these seminars or workshops been required of students as part of the college/school/department of education at your university or college entitlement for teaching certificate process?

    One respondent replied yes; others no.

Question 12 is intentionally omitted, as it was included only as a means of identifying workshop instructors should further reference be required.

13. Is there presently a demand for a seminar or workshop in communication skills for public school teachers?

    A. No 11 (46%) B. Yes 4 (17%) C. No Response 9 (37%)

14. Is there a full time faculty member(s) specializing in communication education in your department?

    A. No 13 (54%)
    B. Yes (1 faculty member) 6 (25%)
    C. Yes (2 faculty members) 3 (13%)
    D. Yes (3 faculty members) 0
    E. Yes (4 or more faculty members) 1 (4%)
    No Response 1 (4%)

15. Is a course(s) in communication education regularly offered in your department's teaching schedule?

    A. No 11 (46%) B. Yes 13 (54%)

16. If you answered "yes" to question 15, what is the name of that course(s)?

Course Categories	Number of Times Referenced
Speech Communication Education (graduate)	2
Teaching of Speech	4
Teaching Speech (Elementary)	3
Teaching Speech (Secondary)	5
Speech Activities (Secondary)	2
Other, special topics	2

*Unless otherwise noted, all percentages are based on the total number of survey respondents (24). All percentages are rounded-off to the nearest half of a percentage point. Thus, some questions reflect a total percentage of either 99% or 101% rather than 100%.

APPENDIX D

RESULTS OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' SURVEY

COMMUNICATION EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
(Public School Administrators)

1. What is the exact title of your position with the school district?

   Superintendent 70 (91%)*
   Assistant Superintendent 1 (1%)
   Superintendent and Principal 4 (5%)
   Superintendent and Teacher 1 (1%)
   Curriculum Coordinator 1 (1%)

2. What level(s) of education is included in your school district?

   A. Elementary (K-8) Only 35 (45%)
   B. Secondary (9-12) Only 11 (14%)
   C. Unit Combination (K-12) 31 (40%)

3. What is the number of full time teachers employed by your school district?

   A. Under 20 teachers 30 (39%)
   B. From 20 to 49 teachers 22 (29%)
   C. From 50 to 75 teachers 13 (17%)
   D. From 76 to 100 teachers 3 (4%)
   E. From 100 to 125 teachers 5 (6%)
   F. More than 125 teachers 4 (5%)

4. Have any teachers in your school district attended a workshop(s) or seminar(s) on communication skills in the past two years?

   A. No 56 (73%)
   B. Yes, 1 workshop 6 (8%)
   C. Yes, 2 workshops 5 (6%)
   D. Yes, 3 workshops 3 (4%)
   E. Yes, More than 3 workshops 3 (4%)
      No Response 4 (5%)

Questions 5 through 9 apply only to school districts with a teacher(s) attending a workshop on communication skills in the past two years. While 17 respondents replied that one or more teachers had attended a workshop(s) during the past two years, only 16 administrators provided specific information about those workshops in questions 5 through 7. Thus percentages in questions 5 through 7 are based on the reporting population of 16 respondents.

5. Where was the workshop(s) or seminar(s) held?

   A. A school district 7 (44%)
   B. A college or university 4 (25%)
   C. A community college 1 (6%)
   D. Other 4 (25%)
      Mt. Vernon Conference; State-Regional Professional Associations

6. Who offered the seminar(s) or workshop(s)?

   A. A school district 2 (13%)
   B. A college or university 1 (6%)
   C. A community college 1 (6%)
   D. Illinois State Board of Education 5 (31%)
   E. Other 7 (44%)
      Southern Illinois University and Special Education Cooperative; County Workshop; Grant from SIESC; Southern Illinois Reading Council; Mt. Vernon Conference; and Industrial Training Division

7. How many teachers attended the workshop(s) or seminar(s)?

   A. 5 or fewer teachers 11 (69%)
   B. From 6 to 11 teachers 1 (6%)
   C. From 12 to 17 teachers 2 (13%)
   D. 18 or more teachers 2 (13%)

8. What was the topic(s) of the seminar(s) or workshop(s)?

   Topics of Workshops

   Reading
   Personal Responsibility for Individual Development
   Communication Skills
   Teacher Effectiveness Training
   Responsibility in Education
   Single Parent Families
   Journalism
   English/Problems in Teaching English

9. If the seminar(s) or workshop(s) was offered by a college or university, please specify the name of the institution (s) and its sponsoring department(s).

Institution	Department
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	College of Communication; English; Special Education
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville	Art
McKendree College	Special Education
Olney Central College	Communication Division

10. Are you willing to provide release time for teachers to attend a workshop or seminar on communication skills?

    1 One day a week per semester 7 (9%)
    2 Up to 3 days per semester 2 (3%)
    3 Between 4 and 6 days per week 2 (3%)
    4 Up to 3 days per year 42 (55%)
    5 No release time 17 (22%)
    No Response 7 (9%)

    Mean Response: 3.93

11. Are you willing to provide financial reimbursement for teachers who attend such a seminar or workshop?

1 No reimbursement 17 (22%)
2 No cash reimbursement but provide paid release time 17 (22%) Mean Response: 2.7
3 Partial reimbursement for overall expenses 19 (25%)
4 Reimbursement for tuition but not for lodging or travel 4 (5%)
5 Complete reimbursement for travel, lodging and tuition 13 (17%)
No Response 7 (9%)

12. What is the total number of teachers in your district that you estimate might attend such a seminar, if such a workshop were available without time or enrollment restriction?

A. No teachers 7 (9%)
B. From 1 to 5 teachers 43 (56%)
C. From 6 to 11 teachers 5 (6%)
D. From 12 to 17 teachers 0
E. 18 or more teachers 4 (5%)
No Response 18 (23%)

13. Would you consider requiring participation of teachers in your district for a seminar or workshop on communication skills?

1 Would definitely no require 29 (38%)
2 Would probably not require 25 (32%) Mean Response: 2
3 Neutral 9 (12%)
4 Would consider requiring 10 (13%)
5 Would require participation 0
No Response 5 (6%)

14. What problems have you observed or discerned with existing teacher workshops or seminars?

15. What problems do you believe might be encountered with a workshop or seminar on communication skills for public school teachers?

Questions 14 and 15 have been consolidated, since most respondents merely noted "See number 14" as a reply for question 15. Many administrators identified more than one item, thus percentages are based on the total number of responses (122).

A. Too expensive 26 (21%)
B. Too distant (geographically) 33 (27%)
C. Inconveniently scheduled 32 (26%)
D. Inappropriate topics 21 (17%)
E. Others 10 (8%)

Lack practicality for school districts; Difficult to find the time; Availability of substitute teachers; quality of substitute teachers;

Ineffective substitutes; and little interest.

No Response 7 (9%) Respondents 70 (91%)

*All percentages, unless otherwise noted, are based on the total number of survey respondents (77). All percentages are rounded-off to the nearest half of a percentage point. Thus, some questions reflect a total percentage of either 99% or 101% as opposed to 100%.